



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

he again harks back to Captain Kidd to whose example he attributes the character of the waterside population in New York during the Revolution. Soon the demands of his argument bring him up to present-day New York and its large Jewish population. Then he hastens back to Hendrick Hudson, while he traces the causes of New York's peculiar attitude toward the Revolution. A diagram tracery of his advance and retreat on the field of history would resemble the diagram of a hard-fought foot-ball game. He rakes New England's history from Salem Witchcraft to the destruction of Hutchinson's mansion in order to convict its worthy Puritans of intolerance, riotous conduct, and hypocrisy. Grim pleasure is taken in the assertions that it was death to say mass in New England, that Indians were burned alive for heresy, that Faneuil Hall was built by a slave-trader, that the Mayflower began as a whaler, then bore the Pilgrims to America, and ended as a slaver. He twits Massachusetts with slavery, and particularly loves to rail at John and Samuel Adams and Benjamin Franklin. He never fails while "beating the bones of the buried" to take a fling at Cromwell. The "lurid rhetoric of the Declaration of Independence" does not, of course, escape his sneer, nor does the "fuss" over the Boston Massacre. The Spanish Fury, the Massacre of St. Bartholomew, the Sicilian Vespers have not altogether "loosened so many capable tongues". This is but one of the many cases where Mr. Belcher's exaggeration becomes merely amusing, for while there is much sarcasm and some wit, there is no sense of humor. Some sharp criticisms are all too true but there is no sympathetic understanding of the frontier conditions which account for many of the worst evils. The author expects the conduct of a Chesterfield from the rude dweller on the margin of America's forests. Of actual error there is no great amount. The date of the Albany Congress is not 1753, Portsmouth (where the Russo-Japanese treaty was made) is not in Maine, there is obviously no proof for the positive assertion that not one-tenth of the tea imported to America paid duty, a statement by Walker, in the *Making of the Nation*, is not "irrefutable proof". Now and then, for a tricky word the author defies the matter, as when he defines the Committees of Correspondence as "secret vigilant societies of the Mafia type". Finally he misses entirely the most important phases of the American Revolution, the great revolution in political practice which went on *pari passu* with the war.

C. H. VAN TYNE.

A History of the President's Cabinet. By MARY L. HINSDALE, Ph.D.
(Ann Arbor: George Wahr. 1911. Pp. ix, 355.)

THERE was real need for a volume such as Miss Hinsdale has written. The literature of merit dealing with the President's Cabinet is notably meagre, considering the importance of the Cabinet as an institution of government. The book under review, one of the *University of Michigan*

Historical series, is a definite and valuable contribution to the general subject of American politics, and will be of service to students of both history and political science.

Although Miss Hinsdale's book is not divided in its typographical arrangement, it logically separates into three parts. The first deals with the origin of the Cabinet; the second with its development under successive Presidents; and the third with general considerations upon the principles of cabinet-making and the relations of the Cabinet to the President and the Congress. The treatment is logical and gives the reader a well-rounded view of the Cabinet, both in regard to its historical development and its present functions.

Good use is made of the material to show the unofficial, almost accidental origin of the Cabinet. Although the framers of the Constitution rejected all the plans proposed for an advisory council to the President, it was soon made plain by the methods employed by Washington that some kind of Cabinet council was sure to develop. The heads of the departments furnished the nucleus for such a council, although at first Washington was disposed to consult them individually and not as a collective body. He followed no regular practice, however, in seeking advice, frequently going outside his executive associates to a "coterie of informal advisers, made up of Madison and Jay, and sometimes Adams". At first Washington showed a marked inclination to consult with the chief justice rather than with his official legal adviser, the Attorney-General. Gradually he came to depend upon the department heads and took the "final and most essential action in the formation of the Cabinet" by instituting, without the authority of law, "a college of advisers made up of the three Department Heads and the Attorney-General". Just when Washington decided to take this step cannot be shown; the "visible separation" of the official from the unofficial advisers is definitely marked by the Cabinet meetings, which, infrequent and irregular for a time, were regularly held by the opening of 1793.

In what has been called the second part of the book, the treatment of the Cabinets of the different Presidents necessarily varies a good deal. Some administrations, some Cabinets, have been vastly more important than others. The plan of the author is to discuss the attitude of each President toward his Cabinet, the motives that controlled him in the selection of its members, the development of the Cabinet's influence, the evolution of its collective character, and, particularly, the contribution of each administration to the formation of the Cabinet as it is to-day. The personal element is given a good deal of prominence, and, as would be expected, adds to the interest of the book. Naturally some of the chapters are not much more than a register of Cabinet appointments, but that is in no way the fault of the author.

The last three chapters deal with subjects that will appeal especially to the student of political science. The titles of these chapters are: Principles of Cabinet Making, Cabinet and Congress, and Cabinet and the

President. Though they deal with familiar material, they constitute a valuable part of the book. Particularly praiseworthy is the manner in which general statements of principle are backed up by the facts of history.

On the whole this is a very satisfactory book. It gives evidence of careful, scholarly work and of conscientious study of the sources. Not the least of its merits are the extended bibliography and fifteen pages of index.

The President's Cabinet: Studies in the Origin, Formation, and Structure of an American Institution. By HENRY BARRETT LEARNED. (New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Henry Frowde. 1912. Pp. xii, 471.)

THAT the importance of the President's Cabinet as an institution of government is to receive wider recognition than has hitherto been the case is indicated by the publication of Mr. Learned's book, following as closely as it does the publication of Miss Hinsdale's *A History of the President's Cabinet*, also noted in this REVIEW. The student of American government, no less than the student of American history, will welcome this new volume.

The purpose of the book, as announced by the author, is "to reveal those factors in the history of the President's Cabinet which explain the origin and formation of the council as well as the establishment of the structural offices which form the institution". No attempt is made, except in an incidental way, to treat of Cabinet practices and personnel; those subjects are reserved for a later study. The present volume is limited "to setting forth the anatomy in contrast to the functions of the Cabinet" and should be judged accordingly. A careful reading forces the conclusion that the author has accomplished his purpose in a very satisfactory manner.

The book consists of thirteen chapters, in addition to the introduction and the appendix. The first chapter is devoted to the historic significance of the term "cabinet" in England, and, though interesting in itself, is not related particularly to the rest of the book and might well have been omitted. Roughly speaking, about half of the book is given to a discussion of the origin and development of the Cabinet as a collective body and to the organization of the principal executive offices in 1789. The remainder is devoted to the establishment of the other Cabinet departments. Of most interest, perhaps, are those chapters in which are discussed the foundations of the Cabinet as revealed in the administrative experience of the states from 1775 to 1789, the development of the idea of a President's council in the deliberations of the Constitutional Convention, and the actual creation of the Cabinet during Washington's first administration. The point of view of the author is that the Cabinet, as a collective body advisory to the President and composed of the heads